

# Exploring Neural Network Pruning with Screening Methods

Mingyuan Wang

*Department of Statistics*  
*Florida State University*  
Tallahassee, Florida, USA  
mw15m@my.fsu.edu

Yangzi Guo

*Department of Mathematics*  
*Florida State University*  
Tallahassee, Florida, USA  
yg12@my.fsu.edu

Sida Liu

*Department of Statistics*  
*Florida State University*  
Tallahassee, Florida, USA  
sl15r@my.fsu.edu

Yanwen Xiao

*Department of Mathematics and Statistics*  
*Northwestern Polytechnical University*  
Xi'an, Shaanxi, China  
xiaoyanwen@mail.nwpu.edu.cn

February 12, 2025

## Abstract

Deep neural networks (DNNs) such as convolutional neural networks (CNNs) for visual tasks, recurrent neural networks (RNNs) for sequence data, and transformer models for rich linguistic or multimodal tasks, achieved unprecedented performance on a wide range of tasks. The impressive performance of modern DNNs is partially attributed to their sheer scale. The latest deep learning models have tens to hundreds of millions of parameters which makes the inference processes resource-intensive. The high computational complexity of these networks prevents their deployment on resource-limited devices such as mobile platforms, IoT devices, and edge computing systems because these devices require energy-efficient and real-time processing capabilities. This paper proposes and evaluates a network pruning framework that eliminates non-essential parameters based on a statistical analysis of network component significance across

classification categories. The proposed method uses screening methods coupled with a weighted scheme to assess connection and channel contributions for unstructured and structured pruning which allows for the elimination of unnecessary network elements without significantly degrading model performance. Extensive experimental validation on real-world vision datasets for both fully connected neural networks (FNNs) and CNNs has shown that the proposed framework produces competitive lean networks compared to the original networks. Moreover, the proposed framework outperforms state-of-art network pruning methods in two out of three cases.

## 1 Introduction

Deep Neural Networks or Deep Learning have revolutionized numerous fields, achieving remarkable success in computer vision [Krizhevsky et al., 2012, Redmon, 2016, He et al., 2017a], natural language processing [Mikolov, 2013, Sutskever, 2014, Devlin, 2018], predictive analytics [Guo et al., 2017, Arora et al., 2022, Lim et al., 2021], and beyond. Much of the last decade has seen intense effort in developing increasingly complicated architectures in the computer vision image classification area, representing models such as VGG [Simonyan, 2014], ResNet [He et al., 2016], DenseNet [Huang et al., 2017], ShuffleNet [Zhang et al., 2018], MobileNet [Howard, 2017], and ViT [Dosovitskiy, 2020]. Despite these advances, the large computational and memory requirements of such models challenge real-time applications and resource-constrained device deployments, such as mobile phones and edge computing platforms. These environments require lightweight models that can balance fast inference speed and acceptable performance, underlined by an urgent need for effective model compression techniques.

These challenges have further spawned various approaches to optimize deep neural networks, such as network pruning [Han et al., 2015, Liu et al., 2017], knowledge distillation [Hinton, 2015, Tian et al., 2019], weight quantization [Jacob et al., 2018, Wu et al., 2018b], low-rank factorization [Sun et al., 2017, Haeffele and Vidal, 2015], neural sparsity encoding [Wu et al., 2018a, Damer et al., 2020], and neural architecture search [Zoph, 2016, Liu et al., 2018], to name a few. Of these, network pruning stands out as one of the effective model compression techniques through the systematic removal of redundant elements like weights, filters, or channels within models. Pruning reduces computational complexity and savings in storage while increasing the potential for inference speed; hence, it has been one practical mean of deploying deep learning models on resource-constrained devices.

Loosely speaking, pruning techniques could be divided into unstructured [Vadera and Ameen, 2022] and structured [Lemaire et al., 2019]. In unstructured pruning, which includes magnitude-based pruning, it is individual weights with small absolute values that are removed, with the outcome being sparse weight matrices. However, unstructured pruning usually leads to irregular sparsity that is difficult for hardware acceleration. On the other hand, structured pruning

removes complete filters, channels, or layers. The nature of the network remains intact-structured-and is more hardware- and library-friendly in most modern deep learning hardware. Among these structured pruning methods, channel pruning has recently gained much attention, since it can directly reduce both computation and storage costs without further post-processing.

Channel pruning [He and Xiao, 2023] methods can be categorized into static and dynamic ones. Static channel pruning [Luo et al., 2017, He et al., 2017b] permanently removes redundant channels based on the importance evaluated in training. Although it makes the model compact and lightweight, the fixed subnetwork often seriously limits the adaptability of the model to diverse input data. Dynamic channel pruning [Lin et al., 2017, Hua et al., 2019], in contrast, performs an adaptive channel selection during inference based on inputs or intermediate feature maps and significantly enriches flexibility to notably boost the performance, although dynamic pruning often needs extra storage for several candidate sub-networks at an acceptable cost and is thus of limited practical use under resource-critical conditions.

The network pruning process typically begins with an either trained or untrained DNN, and two main strategies which are iterative pruning and one-time pruning can be employed. Iterative removal procedure is widely applied not only in neural network pruning fields but also in fields like feature selection [Barbu et al., 2021], graph network optimization [Yang et al., 2021], and beyond. Iterative pruning [Tan and Motani, 2020, Guo et al., 2021a] gradually removes unimportant elements over multiple steps, often guided by a decay or annealing function, allowing the network to adapt and recover through retraining after each step. In contrast, one-time pruning [Liu et al., 2017, van Amersfoort et al., 2020] eliminates all unimportant components in a single step, offering faster execution but requiring careful tuning to minimize performance degradation. A critical aspect of pruning is selecting an appropriate metric to identify elements for removal. Commonly used metrics include magnitude-based pruning, which removes smaller weights deemed less important; gradient-based pruning, which evaluates the sensitivity of weights or channels through their gradients during training; and correlation-based pruning, which targets redundant features or channels exhibiting high similarity. The choice of metric is closely tied to the pruning granularity—weight pruning focuses on fine-grained optimization by removing individual weights, while channel pruning emphasizes structural sparsity by eliminating entire filters or channels.

In this paper, our major contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We propose a novel network pruning technique that leverages statistical analysis to identify and eliminate non-essential parameters by evaluating the significance of network components across different classification categories.
- Our approach is inspired by feature screening methodologies to assess the contributions of connections and channels to the deep learning neural networks for both unstructured and structured pruning, which brings an

effective removal of redundant network components without loss of model performance.

- Extensive experiments on real-world vision datasets such as MNIST and CIFAR validate the effectiveness of our method. The proposed screening method demonstrates promising performance on its own, though it may not consistently align with the results of state-of-the-art network pruning techniques. When combined with a magnitude-based approach, the hybrid method achieves superior or highly competitive results, highlighting the efficacy and complementary nature of the proposed screening strategy.

## 2 Related Work

In this section, we will discuss existing works related to our framework.

### 2.1 Unstructured Weight Pruning

Unstructured weight pruning is aimed at reducing the number of parameters in a neural network by removing unimportant or redundant weights or connections. In recent ones, one of the simplest and most efficient strategy for pruning weights relies on the magnitudes [Han et al., 2015, Zhu and Gupta, 2017, Kusupati et al., 2020, Guo et al., 2021a, Guo et al., 2021b]. This assumes that weights of smaller magnitudes are less important and thus contribute less to the performance of a model. It is a computationally inexpensive approach, because one needs only the computation of either  $l_1$  or  $l_2$  norms, which, in turn, can be highly scalable for big models. On that aspect, [Guo et al., 2016] developed a pruning strategy that integrates the aspect of connection slicing during pruning to evade incorrect pruning. Connection slicing allows the pruning of parameters in whole groups or slabs and ensures the structural integrity of the network. Such methods thus tend to avoid removing key connections that are crucial for a model’s good performance. [Lin et al., 2020] and [Savarese et al., 2019] leverage gradient-based criteria for unstructured weight pruning by refining the pruning process by modifying aspects such as the behavior of forward propagation or approximating  $l_0$  regularization. Unstructured weight pruning mostly is related to sparse matrix operation implementation. Typically, specialized libraries or hardware should be utilized to fully leverage unstructured pruning. This limits the applicability in certain practical scenarios.

### 2.2 Structured Channel Pruning

Structured channel pruning offers much more significant acceleration of the model. The primary focus of structured channel pruning lies in removing whole channels, providing considerable gain during deployment, especially in hardware environments. There are methods to do structure pruning according to select the trainable channels. [Luo and Wu, 2018] select the target channels based on the importance score of neurons. [Liu et al., 2017] conduct channel pruning with

regularization by scaling factors over Batchnorm (BN) layer. [Ding et al., 2019] generate target filters/channels for slimming down models, while [xin Zhang et al., 2021] choose the channels contributing more to the network output.

Recent advancements further introduce diverse strategies for evaluating channel importance. Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence-based methods [Luo and Wu, 2019] quantify the channel information loss between the original and pruned networks by measuring the statistical distance between their output distributions. Simulated annealing-based approaches [Nayman et al., 2019] adapt the classical annealing-based optimization algorithm to the channel pruning context. Importance sampling techniques [Baykal et al., 2019] leverage statistical sampling theory to estimate channel importance efficiently.

### 2.3 Feature Screening

Screening methods feature selection methods have been extensively utilized in machine learning. A survey [Wang and Barbu, 2019] that specifically focused on screening methods conducted comprehensive experiments to show various screening methods' performance on both regression and classification tasks. In [Shakeela et al., 2021], an intrusion detection model that incorporated F-statistics screening method and decision trees was introduced. It showed that simpler models with equivalent performance can be built using screening methods. Screening methods have also been applied to neural networks, especially in text-mining tasks. [Wang and Zhou, 2021] introduced a  $\chi^2$  scores based method that focuses on removing redundant text features. Recently more variants of the traditional screening methods were introduced to handle the newer challenges in modern data. A set of online screening methods was developed in [Wang and Barbu, 2022] to tackle challenges from large streaming data with sparsity and concept drifting properties.

## 3 Proposed Method

We give a comprehensive and detailed description in this section, ranging from methodological underpinnings to operational mechanisms of the Network Pruning with Screening framework. First of all, we set up the theoretical framework based on the formal statement and mathematical formulation of the classic problem of network pruning. then, we derive and discuss the screening methodologies, showing its capabilities in quantifying the importance of various neural network components, such as weights, connections, and channels regarding categorical classification. After that, we give an elaborate discussion on the algorithm procedure and practical implementation of our pruning framework upon the two pruning paradigms: unstructured weight pruning and structured channel pruning.

### 3.1 Network Pruning Formulation

Given a dataset  $\mathcal{D} = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i), i = 1, \dots, N\}$ , where  $\mathbf{x}_i$  represents input features and  $y_i$  is the corresponding target output, we aim to address the neural network pruning problem using constrained optimization. Let the parameters of the network be denoted by  $\mathcal{W} = \{(\mathbf{W}_j, \mathbf{b}_j), j = 1, \dots, L\}$  where  $\mathbf{W}_j$  and  $\mathbf{b}_j$  represents weight matrix and bias vector in each network layer. Let the loss function be denoted as  $L(\mathcal{W})$ . The pruning task can be expressed as

$$\min_{\mathcal{W}} L(\mathcal{W}) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \|\mathcal{W}^*\|_0 \leq r\|\mathcal{W}\|_0 \quad (1)$$

where the  $L_0$  norm restricts the number of non-zero parameters  $\|\mathcal{W}^*\|_0$  to a fraction  $r$  of  $\|\mathcal{W}\|_0$ , where  $r$  a known positive float in range  $(0, 1)$ . In this approach, the individual parameters in the parameter space  $\mathcal{W}$  are eliminated irrespective of the position, which ultimately leads to sparse weights irregularly across layers. Though the method provides good flexibility, to realize its benefit in terms of computation, it needs specialized hardware or sparse matrix libraries in most cases.

When pruning focuses on structured elements of CNNs such as filters or channels, we can reformulate the problem as

$$\min_{\mathcal{W}} L(\mathcal{W}) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \|\mathcal{C}^*\|_0 \leq r\|\mathcal{C}\|_0 \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathcal{C} = \{C_j, j = 1, \dots, M\}$  is the set of filters or channels within the network, and fraction  $r$  bounds the number of non-zero filters or channels to  $\|\mathcal{C}^*\|_0$ . It therefore yields structured sparsity where zero parameters are localized within particular filters or channels. This makes the approach more hardware-friendly and thus much easier to realize in real-world systems.

Both weight-level and channel-level pruning problems benefit from the constrained formulations using the sparsity ratio  $r$  that is interpretable and practical. In particular,  $r$  directly controls the level of sparsity and allows fine-tuning of the pruned model more easily.

In this work, we consider the study of weight-level pruning for general networks and channel-level pruning for CNNs that involve Batch Normalization layers as a representative family of models where structured sparsity is induced due to these pruning methods. Solving these formulations would allow us to enhance computational efficiency while preserving predictive model performance.

### 3.2 F-statistic Screening Methodology

In this study, we use F-statistic screening method to achieve pruning goals of selected neural networks. Our experimental experience shows that the F-statistic screen method can perform well to balance the efficiency and accuracy. It is compatible with the classification tasks this study focuses on.

**F-statistic Score** The F-statistic score method is based on the calculation of the  $F$ -statistic. It is essentially the ratio of the between-class variance and the within-class variance. In practice, a feature is split into groups by the class

labels. Then the  $F$ -statistic is calculated to examine if there are statistically significant mean differences across groups. For each feature  $X_j$  and a label vector  $Y$  with  $C$  classes, the  $F$ -statistic can be calculated as:

$$F_j = \frac{\sum_{c=1}^C n_c (\bar{X}_{j_c} - \bar{X}_j)^2 / (C - 1)}{\sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{i \in A_c} (X_{j_{ci}} - \bar{X}_{j_c})^2 / (N - C)} \quad (3)$$

Where  $n_c$  is the number of instances in class  $c$ ,  $N$  is the total number of all instances,  $\bar{X}_{j_c}$  is the mean value of  $X_j$  in class  $c$  and  $\bar{X}_j$  is the mean value of  $X_j$ .  $A_c = \{i | \forall a_i \in X_{j_c}\}$ . Generally speaking, the higher the  $F$ -statistic, the more separated the labels are by values of that feature and therefore the more relevant that feature is for classification.

**Online F-statistic Score** In modern data science, especially in the neural network setting, the magnitude of data can be enormous when it comes to either the number of instances or the number of features, or both. This often causes memory issues and computing time issues. One of the solutions is to utilize an online data processing method. Here we introduce an online F score method that only occupies less memory space and has potentially faster computing speed. For the clarity of expression, the feature index  $j$  will be omitted. For example, the  $\bar{X}_{j_c}$  in equation 3 will just be  $\bar{X}_c$ .  $\bar{X}_c$  can be represented as  $\frac{S_c}{n_c}$ , where  $S_c$  is the sum of feature values in class  $c$  and  $n_c$  is the number of instances in class  $c$ . Similarly,  $\bar{X}$  is  $\frac{S}{N}$ , where  $S$  is the sum of all feature values and  $N$  is the number of all instances. Breaking up the summation part of the denominator of equation 3:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{i \in A_c} (X_{ci} - \bar{X}_c)^2 &= \sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{i \in A_c} (X_{ci}^2 - 2X_{ci}\bar{X}_c + \bar{X}_c^2) \\ &= \sum_{c=1}^C (SS_c - 2\bar{X}_c S_c + n_c \bar{X}_c^2) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Where  $SS_c$  is the sum of the squared feature values that fall into class  $c$ . Now instead of storing the entire dataset in the memory when calculating the F score, the dataset is iterated in batches. Parameters  $SS_c$ ,  $S_c$ ,  $S$ ,  $n_c$ , and  $N$  can be cumulatively updated by going through the batches. This aligns with the batch update scheme of usual neural network training. A feature matrix of size  $(k, p)$  is generated each time the neural network model trains on the data batch, where  $k$  is the number of instances in a batch and  $p$  is the number of features (i.e. connections, weights, channels, etc.). This matrix along with label vector are used to update the parameters. Towards the end of each epoch, the F-score  $S(w)$  will be calculated from these parameters. The  $N$  and  $C$  are scalars.  $n_c$  is the number of instances in each class.  $SS_c$ ,  $S_c$ ,  $S$  are 1-D arrays with the size of the number of total features. Thus the space is significantly compressed. The computing speed also increased due to faster indexing on batch.

### 3.3 Algorithm Description

Following are some key principles of our algorithm design: 1) We integrate F-statistic screening technique together with the magnitude of parameters to establish a unified metric. The unified metric will evaluate the contribution of each parameter and channel to deep neural networks, which can enable both unstructured and structured pruning strategies; 2) A carefully designed pruning schedule is implemented to directly control the desired sparsity in the parameter space, offering flexibility to meet specific computational and storage requirements; 3) We systematically identify and remove the least important parameters or channels to streamline computations with minimal loss of accuracy. These ideas are captured by the proposed algorithms, which are prototyped in Algorithm 1 and 2. Starting from an untrained or pre-trained model.

---

#### Algorithm 1 Weight-Level Screening Network Pruning (WLS)

---

**Input:** Training set  $T = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ , pruning ratio  $\{r_j\}_{j=1}^L$ , pruning schedule  $\{f(e, r_j), e = 1, \dots, E\}_{j=1}^L$ , an DNN model.

**Output:** Pruned DNN with parameters respect to pruning ratio  $\{r_j\}_{j=1}^L$  in parameter space  $\{\mathcal{W}_j | \cup \mathcal{W}_j = \mathcal{W} \ \& \ \cap \mathcal{W}_j = \emptyset\}_{j=1}^L$ .

- 1: If the DNN is not pre-trained, train it to a satisfying level.
  - 2: **for**  $e = 1$  to  $E$  **do**
  - 3:   Sequentially update  $\mathcal{W} \leftarrow \mathcal{W} - \eta \frac{\partial L(\mathcal{W})}{\partial \mathcal{W}}$  via backpropagation.
  - 4:   Update parameters of screening score  $S(w)$  using batch data.
  - 5:   **for**  $j = 1$  to  $L$  **do**
  - 6:     Based on the pruning schedule, either continue training or prune the weights with  $f(e, r_j)$  most relevant left in  $\mathcal{W}_j$  based on ranking metric  $\mathcal{M}$ .
  - 7:   **end for**
  - 8: **end for**
  - 9: Fine-tune the pruned DNN if needed.
- 

The WLS and CLS algorithms prune neural networks in an efficient way by iteratively or one-time removing the least important parameters or channels, guided by a pruning schedule. Whether to retain or discard a parameter or channel is determined by a predefined ranking metric  $\mathcal{M}$ , independent of the objective loss function  $L$ . The independence of the loss function makes the method special among many pruning techniques, which require changes in the loss and are thus not that suitable for pre-trained models. In the method, scaling-up simplicity and scalability make it effective to prune while maintaining network integrity.

Traditional neural network pruning methods generally do not take the influence of the training samples in the pruning process. On the other hand, F-statistic can be employed to measure the importance of every training sample, weights, and filters with their class labels. Thus, we define the ranking metric by fusing the traditional magnitude-based method with an F-statistic-



---

**Algorithm 2 Channel-Level Screening Network Pruning (CLS)**

---

**Input:** Training set  $T = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ , pruning ratio  $\{r_j\}_{j=1}^L$ , pruning schedule  $\{f(e, r_j), e = 1, \dots, E\}_{j=1}^L$ , an CNN model.

**Output:** Pruned DNN with parameters respect to pruning ratio  $\{r_j\}_{j=1}^L$  in channel space  $\{\mathcal{C}_j \mid \cup \mathcal{C}_j = \mathcal{C} \ \& \ \cap \mathcal{C}_j = \emptyset\}_{j=1}^L$ .

- 1: If the DNN is not pre-trained, train it to a satisfying level.
  - 2: **for**  $e = 1$  to  $E$  **do**
  - 3:   Sequentially update  $\mathcal{W} \leftarrow \mathcal{W} - \eta \frac{\partial L(\mathcal{W})}{\partial \mathcal{W}}$  via backpropagation.
  - 4:   Update parameters of screening score  $S(w)$  using batch data.
  - 5:   **for**  $j = 1$  to  $L$  **do**
  - 6:     Based on the pruning schedule, either continue training or prune the channels with  $f(e, r_j)$  most relevant left in  $\mathcal{C}_j$  based on ranking metric  $\mathcal{M}$ .
  - 7:   **end for**
  - 8: **end for**
  - 9: Fine-tune the pruned CNN if needed.
- 

based screening method which calculates the mutual information score. The combination of these two components in a weighted manner forms the final ranking metric. This would lead to much-informed pruning.

In the case of unstructured weight pruning, we leverage the screening score  $S(w)$  which evaluates the significance of network weights across different classification categories with weight magnitude itself to define the ranking metric  $\mathcal{M}$ .

$$\mathcal{M}(w) = \alpha \cdot S(w) + (1 - \alpha) \cdot |w|, w \in \mathcal{W}, \alpha \in (0, 1] \quad (5)$$

In the case of structured channel pruning, various methods have been suggested. One class of metrics relies the Batch Normalization (BN) scale parameters, as BN has become standard in modern deep convolutional neural networks for accelerating training and improving convergence. The transformation in a BN layer is defined as

$$BN(z_{in}) = \frac{z_{in} - \mu_{\mathbf{B}}}{\sqrt{\sigma_{\mathbf{B}}^2 + \epsilon}}; z_{out} = \gamma \cdot BN(z_{in}) + \beta$$

where  $\mu_{\mathbf{B}}$  and  $\sigma_{\mathbf{B}}$  denote the mean and variance over the mini-batch  $\mathbf{B}$ , and  $\gamma$  and  $\beta$  are trainable scale and shift parameters. [Liu et al., 2017] exploit the  $\gamma$  parameters in BN layers for channel pruning, proposing that the  $L_1$ -norm of  $\gamma$  be used to guide the pruning process. Here, we further leverage the screening score  $S(\mathcal{C})$  which evaluates the significance of network channels across different classification categories with the  $L_1$ -norm of  $\gamma$  to define the ranking metric  $\mathcal{M}$ .

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{C}) = \alpha \cdot S(\mathcal{C}) + (1 - \alpha) \cdot |\gamma_{\mathcal{C}}|, \alpha \in (0, 1] \quad (6)$$

Finally, we can do fine-tuning after pruning to recover any lost performance if needed. For unstructured weight pruning, we remove neurons that do not have

any incoming or outgoing connections after pruning. For structured channel pruning, we eliminate convolution channels composed entirely of zero parameters to get a compact network that can do efficient inference.

## 4 Experiments

In this section, we first demonstrate unstructured weight pruning on the classical FNN LeNet-300-100 using the MNIST dataset [LeCun and Cortes, 2010]. Next, we conduct experiments on structured channel pruning with DenseNet-40 [Huang et al., 2017] and two classical CNNs, ResNet-164 [He et al., 2016], using the CIFAR dataset [Krizhevsky et al., 2009].

### 4.1 Unstructured Weight Pruning on MNIST

MNIST dataset [LeCun and Cortes, 2010] is one of the well-known benchmark datasets that is being widely used for evaluating machine learning and deep learning models. The MNIST dataset includes grayscale images of handwritten digits from 0 to 9. It contains 50K training samples, 10K validation samples, and 10K testing samples. Each image is 28x28 pixels in size. Its small size make it very popular for the testing and comparison of new algorithms in classification tasks. In this section, we will evaluate the WLS pruning method on LeNet-300-100.

LeNet-300-100 [LeCun et al., 1998] is a classical FNN with two hidden layers consisting of 300 neurons and 100 neurons, respectively. It is a simple but effective architecture in non-convolutional tasks and thus has been widely used for exploring pruning strategies. LeNet-300-100 contains roughly 267K learnable parameters, both provide a wide range of settings to evaluate the flexibility and effectiveness of the proposed pruning approach.

We go about simultaneous training and pruning on LeNet-300-100. Inspiration by [Dawer et al., 2017], we define an annealing function to drive the iterative pruning. The logistic annealing function exhibits behavior that provides a sensible trajectory, that it decays initially very slowly, with a gradual allowance of the neural network to get sufficiently trained while removing only a small portion of unimportant weights, so-called "junk weights." As the training progresses and the network becomes more stable, the logistic function further accelerates the pruning. Since by this stage, the network has already learned the underlying patterns, it is efficient to aggressively prune a big portion of the remaining junk weights rather fast. Finally, the function slows down when most of the unimportant weights have been pruned and transitions into a more gradual pruning phase. This way, it makes sure that the rest of the weights are carefully fine-tuned without destabilizing the model. Figure 1 shows that the function can dynamically balance training and pruning during the whole process. This allows an effective balancing between model accuracy conservation and high sparsity during the pruning process.




Figure 1: Logistic Annealing Schedule with decay rate in  $\{2.0, 4.0, 6.0, 8.0\}$

We use SGD to train and simultaneously prune LeNet-300-100 for 80 epochs in total, with a minibatch size of 128 on the MNIST dataset. The initial learning rate is 0.1 and is divided by half every 10 epochs. Weight decay is  $1 \times 10^{-4}$  and Nesterov momentum [Sutskever et al., 2013] with a value of 0.9 (no dampening) is used to assist convergence.

Model	Best Error	Params	Prune Rate
Lenet-300-100 (Baseline)	1.64%	267k	-
Lenet-300-100 (Han [Han et al., 2015])	1.59%	22K	91.8%
Lenet-300-100 (Barbu [Guo et al., 2021a])	1.57%	17.4K	93.5%
Lenet-300-100 (Ours)	<b>1.51%</b>	<b>11.5K</b>	<b>95.7%</b>

Table 1: Unstructured weight pruning comparison on LeNet-300-100.

Model	Layer	Params.	Han%	Barbu%	Ours%
Lenet-300-100	fc1	236K	8%	4.6%	<b>4.1%</b>
	fc2	30K	9%	20.1%	<b>5.3%</b>
	fc3	1K	26%	68.5%	<b>22.4%</b>
	Total	267K	8.2%	6.5%	<b>4.3%</b>

Table 2: Layer by layer compression comparisons on LeNet-300-100.

These are summarized in the following tables, which highlight the effectiveness of the proposed screening-based pruning. The best performance is at  $\alpha = 0.4$ , with 95.7% of the weights pruned at a test error of only 1.51%. F-statistic screening pruning approach attains higher accuracy and also eliminates more redundant parameters compared to the pruning methods of [Han et al., 2015] and [Guo et al., 2021a].

LeNet	$\alpha = 0.2$	$\alpha = 0.4$	$\alpha = 0.6$	$\alpha = 0.8$	$\alpha = 1.0$
Best Error	1.57%	<b>1.51%</b>	1.69%	2.40%	6.46%

Table 3: Best error with Ranking metric by different  $\alpha$  on LeNet-300-100.




Figure 2: The mask of the first fully connected layer of pruned Lenet-300-100. The blue dots are the remaining connections. The horizontal axis is the inputs. The vertical axis is the first layer nodes.

In contrast, the poorest performance is  $\alpha = 1.0$ , reflecting that the reliance solely on F-statistic screening score may fail to capture true importance of each weight. While it is quite intuitive, explicit inclusion of weight magnitude into the ranking metric makes a major improvement in pruning effectiveness. As a matter of fact, this yields an optimum tradeoff between model compression and accuracy.

Table 2 lists the layer-wise comparison of achieved compression rates against state-of-the-art methods. Although all three pruning methods give roughly the same overall accuracy, they generate distinctly different network structures. In LeNet-300-100, for example, the first layer is pruned the most, that probably implies that after the first full-connected layer reduces most of the useless features in this dataset, the output fully-connected layer keeps a number of parameters big enough to process these informative features further into classes.

We also plotted the first fully connected layer of Lenet-300-100 after pruning. Figure 2 shows the remaining connections in color. The image has 28 vertical bins which are the 28-pixel rows of a 28 by 28 input image. The bins towards the left and right sides relate to the top and bottom pixels in the image. They are the most pruned. For each bin, pixels towards the edges of the bin are also pruned primarily. The bin edges correspond to the left and right sides of the image. This suggests that the pruned model heavily focuses on the center of the image. It is where the number is. In addition, the bins close to the top are pruned slightly more than the bins close to the bottom. This suggests that the discriminative information leans more towards the bottom region.

## 4.2 Structured Channel Pruning on CIFAR

The CIFAR-10 dataset, as introduced by [Krizhevsky et al., 2009], are among the popular benchmarks for image classification and object recognition. There are 60K natural color images of size  $32 \times 32$ . There are 50K training images and 10K test images. CIFAR-10 consists of 10 object categories, with 6K images per class.

We evaluate the effectiveness of the CLS pruning method for two deep neural network architectures: ResNet-164 [He et al., 2016] and DenseNet-40 [Huang et al., 2017]. ResNet-164 here adapts its architecture on the CIFAR dataset. On the other hand, DenseNet-40 is a reduced-size version of the DenseNet, including 40 layers with a growth rate of 12.

Each is trained from scratch to establish baseline performances which are comparable in [Liu et al., 2017]. Training is done for 160 epochs with a batch size of 64. We adopt the SGD optimizer with an initial learning rate of 0.1, weight decay  $1 \times 10^{-4}$  and momentum 0.9. The learning rate is divided by 10 at 50% and 75% of the total training epochs. Furthermore, standard data augmentation techniques including normalization, random flipping and cropping are employed.

We then perform one-shot global pruning with a pre-defined pruning ratio  $r$  and further conduct different learning schedules to fine-tune the pruned networks. The best results are summarized in following tables.

CNN	Model	Error (%)	Channels	Pruned
ResNet-164	Baseline [Liu et al., 2017]	5.42	12112	
	Pruned [Liu et al., 2017]	5.27	4845	60%
	Pruned (Ours)	<b>5.18</b>	4845	60%
DenseNet-40	Baseline [Liu et al., 2017]	6.11	9360	-
	Pruned [Liu et al., 2017]	5.65	2808	70%
	Pruned [Guo et al., 2021a])	5.57	2808	70%
	Pruned	5.63	2808	70%

Table 4: Pruning performance results comparison on CIFAR-10.

ResNet	$\alpha = 0.2$	$\alpha = 0.4$	$\alpha = 0.6$	$\alpha = 0.8$	$\alpha = 1.0$
Best Error	<b>5.18%</b>	5.20%	5.77%	6.52%	8.44%

Table 5: Best error with Ranking metric by different  $\alpha$  on ResNet-164.

These results of channel pruning applied to the network models for CIFAR-10 include two models, namely, ResNet164 with 60% reduction and DenseNet-40 with a 70% reduction, and have clearly depicted the performance of our proposed CLS algorithm. Our results show that the F-statistic based CLS pruning approach is competitive with previous methods proposed in [Liu et al.,

DenseNet	$\alpha = 0.2$	$\alpha = 0.4$	$\alpha = 0.6$	$\alpha = 0.8$	$\alpha = 1.0$
Best Error	5.78%	<b>5.63%</b>	6.21%	6.89%	8.08%

Table 6: Best error with Ranking metric by different  $\alpha$  on DenseNet-40.




Figure 3: A plot depicting the number of original and remaining channels after pruning across different BatchNorm2D layers of DenseNet-40. The x-axis represents sequential layer numbers, while the y-axis shows the number of channels.

2017] and [Guo et al., 2021a]. Our method does not require a change in the training loss function, hence is quite efficient and easy to implement.

A similar trend to that of LeNet-300-100 with respect to the weighting factor  $\alpha$  in ranking metric is depicted here. The weakest pruning performance is at  $\alpha = 1.0$ , showing that completely relying on the F-statistic screening score may not capture each channel’s significance well. By contrast, including weight magnitude into the ranking metric improves overall pruning effectiveness. This gives a best test error of 5.18% for ResNet-164 at  $\alpha = 0.2$ , while DenseNet-40 results are best for the same test error of 5.63% at  $\alpha = 0.4$ .

We also visualized the impact of pruning on DenseNet-40 ( $\alpha = 0.4$ ) on CIFAR-10 by generating two plots. Figure 3 illustrates the number of remaining channels in each layer. It reveals that two transition layers (layer 13 and 26) exhibit a lower pruning ratio compared to dense blocks layers. Pruning these layers aggressively could disrupt the flow of information through the network since transition layers maintain connectivity between dense blocks. Figure 4 shows the values of the remaining weights after pruning. It illustrates that the pruning process effectively remove less important, near-zero weights while retaining moderately high-magnitude weights critical for maintaining performance. These plots provide insights into how pruning affects the network’s structure and parameter distribution. It also shows an evidence on our model’s ability to keep the balance between sparsity and performance.




Figure 4: A histogram showing the distribution of non-zero weight values after pruning. The x-axis represents weight magnitude, and the y-axis indicates the frequency of weights. The plot reveals that most remaining weights are concentrated between 0.2 and 0.5.

## 5 Conclusion

Deep neural networks have brought about a revolution in machine learning and, today, form a very strong machinery of learning complex representations from diverse domains. Despite their great success, the modern DNNs also suffer from severe computational challenges. The training and inference of modern DNNs become extremely resource-intensive due to tens to hundreds of millions of parameters. In this paper, a network-pruning technique has been presented that removes unnecessary parameters to alleviate these issues. Pruning has been done based on the statistical impact of every network parameter on classification categories. Contribution analysis for the connections and channels using screening methods in our proposed approach does unstructured and structured pruning, which gives the leverage of removing unnecessary elements without affecting model performance. Our extensive experimental evaluation using real-world vision datasets, including both FNNs and CNNs, shows that the proposed screening approach alone could give promising results but cannot always outperform state-of-the-art pruning methods. In contrast, the hybrid method with the magnitude-based pruning approach yields much better or at least highly competitive performance, thereby presenting a practical solution toward neural network optimization in efficiency.

## References

- [Arora et al., 2022] Arora, P., Jalali, S. M. J., Ahmadian, S., Panigrahi, B. K., Suganthan, P. N., and Khosravi, A. (2022). Probabilistic wind power forecasting using optimized deep auto-regressive recurrent neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, 19(3):2814–2825.

- [Barbu et al., 2021] Barbu, A., Sun, L., Wang, M., and Guo, Y. (2021). A novel framework for online supervised learning with feature selection. In *2021 Joint Mathematics Meetings (JMM)*. AMS.
- [Baykal et al., 2019] Baykal, C., Liebenwein, L., Gilitschenski, I., Feldman, D., and Rus, D. (2019). Sipping neural networks: Sensitivity-informed provable pruning of neural networks. *ArXiv*, abs/1910.05422.
- [Dawer et al., 2017] Dawer, G., Guo, Y., and Barbu, A. (2017). Generating compact tree ensembles via annealing. *2020 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, pages 1–8.
- [Dawer et al., 2020] Dawer, G., Guo, Y., Liu, S., and Barbu, A. (2020). Neural rule ensembles: Encoding sparse feature interactions into neural networks. In *2020 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, pages 1–8. IEEE.
- [Devlin, 2018] Devlin, J. (2018). Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*.
- [Ding et al., 2019] Ding, X., Ding, G., Guo, Y., and Han, J. (2019). Centripetal sgd for pruning very deep convolutional networks with complicated structure. *2019 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 4938–4948.
- [Dosovitskiy, 2020] Dosovitskiy, A. (2020). An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*.
- [Guo et al., 2017] Guo, H., Tang, R., Ye, Y., Li, Z., and He, X. (2017). Deepfm: a factorization-machine based neural network for ctr prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.04247*.
- [Guo et al., 2021a] Guo, Y., She, Y., and Barbu, A. (2021a). Network pruning via annealing and direct sparsity control. In *2021 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, pages 1–8.
- [Guo et al., 2021b] Guo, Y., Wu, Y. N., and Barbu, A. (2021b). A study of local optima for learning feature interactions using neural networks. In *2021 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, pages 1–8.
- [Guo et al., 2016] Guo, Y., Yao, A., and Chen, Y. (2016). Dynamic network surgery for efficient dnns. In *Advances In Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1379–1387.
- [Haeffele and Vidal, 2015] Haeffele, B. D. and Vidal, R. (2015). Global optimality in tensor factorization, deep learning, and beyond. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.07540*.
- [Han et al., 2015] Han, S., Pool, J., Tran, J., and Dally, W. (2015). Learning both weights and connections for efficient neural network. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 28.



- [He et al., 2017a] He, K., Gkioxari, G., Dollár, P., and Girshick, R. (2017a). Mask r-cnn. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 2961–2969.
- [He et al., 2016] He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S., and Sun, J. (2016). Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 770–778.
- [He and Xiao, 2023] He, Y. and Xiao, L. (2023). Structured pruning for deep convolutional neural networks: A survey. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*.
- [He et al., 2017b] He, Y., Zhang, X., and Sun, J. (2017b). Channel pruning for accelerating very deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 1389–1397.
- [Hinton, 2015] Hinton, G. (2015). Distilling the knowledge in a neural network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02531*.
- [Howard, 2017] Howard, A. G. (2017). Mobilenets: Efficient convolutional neural networks for mobile vision applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.04861*.
- [Hua et al., 2019] Hua, W., Zhou, Y., De Sa, C. M., Zhang, Z., and Suh, G. E. (2019). Channel gating neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32.
- [Huang et al., 2017] Huang, G., Liu, Z., Van Der Maaten, L., and Weinberger, K. Q. (2017). Densely connected convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4700–4708.
- [Jacob et al., 2018] Jacob, B., Kligys, S., Chen, B., Zhu, M., Tang, M., Howard, A., Adam, H., and Kalenichenko, D. (2018). Quantization and training of neural networks for efficient integer-arithmetic-only inference. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 2704–2713.
- [Krizhevsky et al., 2009] Krizhevsky, A., Hinton, G., et al. (2009). Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images.
- [Krizhevsky et al., 2012] Krizhevsky, A., Sutskever, I., and Hinton, G. E. (2012). Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 25.
- [Kusupati et al., 2020] Kusupati, A., Ramanujan, V., Somani, R., Wortsman, M., Jain, P., Kakade, S. M., and Farhadi, A. (2020). Soft threshold weight reparameterization for learnable sparsity. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.

- [LeCun et al., 1998] LeCun, Y., Bottou, L., Bengio, Y., and Haffner, P. (1998). Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 86(11):2278–2324.
- [LeCun and Cortes, 2010] LeCun, Y. and Cortes, C. (2010). MNIST handwritten digit database.
- [Lemaire et al., 2019] Lemaire, C., Achkar, A., and Jodoin, P.-M. (2019). Structured pruning of neural networks with budget-aware regularization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 9108–9116.
- [Lim et al., 2021] Lim, B., Arık, S. Ö., Loeff, N., and Pfister, T. (2021). Temporal fusion transformers for interpretable multi-horizon time series forecasting. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 37(4):1748–1764.
- [Lin et al., 2017] Lin, J., Rao, Y., Lu, J., and Zhou, J. (2017). Runtime neural pruning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- [Lin et al., 2020] Lin, T., Stich, S. U., Barba, L., Dmitriev, D., and Jaggi, M. (2020). Dynamic model pruning with feedback. *ArXiv*, abs/2006.07253.
- [Liu et al., 2018] Liu, H., Simonyan, K., and Yang, Y. (2018). Darts: Differentiable architecture search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.09055*.
- [Liu et al., 2017] Liu, Z., Li, J., Shen, Z., Huang, G., Yan, S., and Zhang, C. (2017). Learning efficient convolutional networks through network slimming. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 2736–2744.
- [Luo and Wu, 2018] Luo, J.-H. and Wu, J. (2018). Autopruner: An end-to-end trainable filter pruning method for efficient deep model inference. *ArXiv*, abs/1805.08941.
- [Luo and Wu, 2019] Luo, J.-H. and Wu, J. (2019). Neural network pruning with residual-connections and limited-data. *2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 1455–1464.
- [Luo et al., 2017] Luo, J.-H., Wu, J., and Lin, W. (2017). Thinet: A filter level pruning method for deep neural network compression. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 5058–5066.
- [Mikolov, 2013] Mikolov, T. (2013). Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781*, 3781.
- [Nayman et al., 2019] Nayman, N., Noy, A., Ridnik, T., Friedman, I., Jin, R., and Zelnik-Manor, L. (2019). Xnas: Neural architecture search with expert advice. *ArXiv*, abs/1906.08031.

- [Redmon, 2016] Redmon, J. (2016). You only look once: Unified, real-time object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*.
- [Savarese et al., 2019] Savarese, P. H. P., Silva, H., and Maire, M. (2019). Winning the lottery with continuous sparsification. *ArXiv*, abs/1912.04427.
- [Shakeela et al., 2021] Shakeela, S., Shankar, N. S., Reddy, P. M., Tulasi, T. K., and Koneru, M. M. (2021). Optimal ensemble learning based on distinctive feature selection by univariate anova-f statistics for ids. *International Journal of Electronics and Telecommunications*, pages 267–275.
- [Simonyan, 2014] Simonyan, K. (2014). Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556*.
- [Sun et al., 2017] Sun, Y., Zheng, L., Deng, W., and Wang, S. (2017). Svdnet for pedestrian retrieval. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 3800–3808.
- [Sutskever, 2014] Sutskever, I. (2014). Sequence to sequence learning with neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.3215*.
- [Sutskever et al., 2013] Sutskever, I., Martens, J., Dahl, G. E., and Hinton, G. E. (2013). On the importance of initialization and momentum in deep learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- [Tan and Motani, 2020] Tan, C. M. J. and Motani, M. (2020). DropNet: Reducing neural network complexity via iterative pruning. In III, H. D. and Singh, A., editors, *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 9356–9366. PMLR.
- [Tian et al., 2019] Tian, Y., Krishnan, D., and Isola, P. (2019). Contrastive representation distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.10699*.
- [Vadera and Ameen, 2022] Vadera, S. and Ameen, S. (2022). Methods for pruning deep neural networks. *IEEE Access*, 10:63280–63300.
- [van Amersfoort et al., 2020] van Amersfoort, J. R., Alizadeh, M., Farquhar, S., Lane, N. D., and Gal, Y. (2020). Single shot structured pruning before training. *ArXiv*, abs/2007.00389.
- [Wang and Barbu, 2019] Wang, M. and Barbu, A. (2019). Are screening methods useful in feature selection? an empirical study. *PloS one*, 14(9):e0220842.
- [Wang and Barbu, 2022] Wang, M. and Barbu, A. (2022). Online feature screening for data streams with concept drift. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 35(11):11693–11707.

- [Wang and Zhou, 2021] Wang, Y. and Zhou, C. (2021). Feature selection method based on chi-square test and minimum redundancy. In *Emerging Trends in Intelligent and Interactive Systems and Applications: Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Intelligent, Interactive Systems and Applications (IISA2020)*, pages 171–178. Springer.
- [Wu et al., 2018a] Wu, J., Wang, Y., Wu, Z., Wang, Z., Veeraraghavan, A., and Lin, Y. (2018a). Deep k-means: Re-training and parameter sharing with harder cluster assignments for compressing deep convolutions. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5363–5372. PMLR.
- [Wu et al., 2018b] Wu, S., Li, G., Chen, F., and Shi, L. (2018b). Training and inference with integers in deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.04680*.
- [xin Zhang et al., 2021] xin Zhang, Y., Lin, M., Lin, C.-W., Chen, J., Huang, F., Wu, Y., Tian, Y., and Ji, R. (2021). Carrying out cnn channel pruning in a white box. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 34:7946–7955.
- [Yang et al., 2021] Yang, Y., Liu, T., Wang, Y., Zhou, J., Gan, Q., Wei, Z., Zhang, Z., Huang, Z., and Wipf, D. (2021). Graph neural networks inspired by classical iterative algorithms. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 11773–11783. PMLR.
- [Zhang et al., 2018] Zhang, X., Zhou, X., Lin, M., and Sun, J. (2018). Shufflenet: An extremely efficient convolutional neural network for mobile devices. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 6848–6856.
- [Zhu and Gupta, 2017] Zhu, M. and Gupta, S. (2017). To prune, or not to prune: exploring the efficacy of pruning for model compression. *ArXiv*, abs/1710.01878.
- [Zoph, 2016] Zoph, B. (2016). Neural architecture search with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.01578*.